

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1 – 2, 6, 8, 11 – 12, 15 – 16, 20 – 21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller, U.S. Patent No. 6,421,707 (hereinafter referred to as “Miller”).

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180, USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). (Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) ¶ 2143.03).

Furthermore, the remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims discussed above and therefore also include the distinguishing claim limitations. As a result, the remaining claims are also not anticipated and are patentable.

CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Naya Chatterjee at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 03/14/2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Naya Chatterjee  
Reg. No. 54,680

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300